UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,000	10/14/2003	Nick Scott Russell	IDF 2420 (4000-13300)	4770

28003 7590 07/16/2008

SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
CAO, PHUONG THAO	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,000	RUSSELL, NICK SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 December 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 12/04/2007.

2. Claim 1 has been amended. Currently, claims 1-22 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3. The formal set of drawings has been received and accepted by Examiner. Therefore, the previous objection to drawings has been withdrawn.

4. Amendment to claim 1 is effective to overcome the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection in the previous office action. Therefore, the previous 112 rejection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 are considered as persuasive. Therefore, the prior art rejections to claims 1-12 have been withdrawn.

6. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 13-22 are moot in light of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1-22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1, language "for…" suggesting intended uses, as recited in "a messaging service system for..." (line 4) and "a computer system for..." (line 9) should be corrected in order to positively recite the functionalities of components in a claimed system.

Regarding claims 1-12, the recited "system" (line 1) should be changed to "computer-implemented system".

Regarding claims 13-22, the recited "method" (line 1) should be changed to "computer-implemented system".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-12 and 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the second systems" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claims 4-7 and 10-12, the use of language "operable to" (claim 4, line 2), (claim 5, line 2), (claim 6, line 2), (claim 7, line 2), (claim 10, line 2), (claim 11, line 2), (claim 12, line 1) make it unclear what Applicant's intended metes and bounds of the claim are, since language "operable to" suggest an option that may or may not happen so the claim appears to cover anything and everything that does not prohibit actions from occurring. Note that replacing "operable to" by "configured to" can overcome this rejection since "configured to" indicates that at one point in time, the functionality would have occurred and that the software was set up/programmed to execute the steps.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of rejected claim 1 upon which they depend.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the test application" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Couch et al. (US Publication No 2003/0126109, effective filing date 01/02/2002).

As to claim 13, Couch et al. teaches:

"A method of viewing messages on a messaging service" (see Couch et al., [0033] for using table function to access the messaging data), comprising:

"selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification" (see Couch et al., [0041] and [0054] for specifying location of the queue, i.e. to locate a queue in a network of computers, its host computer must be identified);

"selecting a queue supported by the messaging by inputting a queue identification" (see Couch et al., [0041] and [0054] to select a specific queue in the host computer including a plurality of queues, the specific queue must be identified)

"reading a message originating from a first test application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third

application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message" (see Couch et al., [0037] and [0057] for displaying a message from the designated message queue to user of a table function building application wherein a table function building application is interpreted as a third application);

"displaying full contents of the message using the third application" (see Couch et al., [0057]).

"verifying that the message has a correct message structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct by reviewing the full contents of the message displayed by the third application" (see Couch et al., [0057] and [0004] for displaying message string which allows viewing and verifying as disclosed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 13, 14 and 21 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al. (US Publication No 2003/0182464,

effective filing date 02/15/2002) in view of Couch et al. (US Publication No 2003/0126109, effective filing date 01/02/2002).

As to claim 13, Hamilton et al. teaches:

"A method of viewing messages on a messaging service" (see Hamilton et al., Abstract), comprising:

"selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification" (see Hamilton et al., [0076] for assigning IP address to a queue object and [0067] for opening the queue by specifying the IP address);

"selecting a queue supported by the messaging by inputting a queue identification" (see Hamilton et al., [0079] for locating a queue based on queue name and IP address).

Hamilton et al. further discloses the interaction to the queue which contains message originating from a first test application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message (see Hamilton et al., [0061] for interacting to the queue manager and the message queues by administrative clients (third application), producer clients (first test application) and consumer clients (second application)).

However, Hamilton et al. does not explicitly teach the interaction to the queue by administrative clients including reading a message from the queue, nor

"displaying full contents of the message using the third application"; and

"verifying that the message has a correct message structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct by reviewing the full contents of the message displayed by the third application".

On the other hand, Couch et al. teaches:

"reading a message originating from a first test application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message" (see Couch et al., [0037] and [0057] for displaying a message from the designated message queue to user of a table function building application wherein a table function building application is interpreted as a third application);

"displaying full contents of the message using the third application" (see Couch et al., [0057]).

"verifying that the message has a correct message structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct by reviewing the full contents of the message displayed by the third application" (see Couch et al., [0057] and [0004] for displaying message string which allows viewing and verifying as disclosed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Couch et al. into Hamilton et al.'s system. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective and flexible way to manage and control messages in the queue since the function of reading and displaying messages on a queue provides the administrator with reading access to

the electronic message itself not just its properties and header information. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and an interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al. and Couch et al. teach:

"wherein the message includes a plurality of attributes" (see Couch et al., [0004]).

As to claim 21, Hamilton et al. teaches:

"A method of testing an application which generates messaging service message" (see Hamilton et al., [0002]), comprising:

"running the test application" (see Hamilton et al., [0002] and [0015] wherein a process is a running application);

"generating a message by the test application directed to a second application" (see Hamilton et al., [0015] for passing messages between processes);

"posting the message to a queue" (see Hamilton et al., [0002]);

"inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue using a third application" (see Hamilton et al., Fig. 10, item 522 for inputting IP address and name of the

queue in a function SetQueueAddress by a local application (i.e., administrative client); also see [0075] and [0076]);

"inputting an identification of the queue using the third application" (see Hamilton et al., [0061] and [0075]-[0076] wherein an administrative client (third application) can used administrative to create an message queue object and assign (i.e., input) a unique name (i.e., identification) for the queue).

Hamilton et al. further discloses the interaction to the queue by the third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message (see Hamilton et al., [0061] for interacting to the queue manager and the message queues by administrative clients (third application), producer clients (test application) and consumer clients (second application)).

However, Hamilton et al. does not explicitly teach the interaction to the queue by administrative clients including destructively reading a message from the queue, nor

"displaying the read message using the third application"; and

"verifying that the read message has a correct message structure, that fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct to verify whether the test application is operating properly".

On the other hand, Couch et al. teaches:

"destructively reading a message originating from a first test application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message" (see Couch et al., [0037] and [0057] for displaying a message from the designated message queue to

user of a table function building application wherein a table function building application is interpreted as a third application; also see [0032] and [0033] for the disclosure of a programming module running on a client computer (e.g., 10a, 10b) which build a table function that can access the message data stored in a message queue and destined to another computer system (e.g., 10c));

"displaying the read message using the third application" (see Couch et al., [0057]).

"verifying that the read message has a correct message structure, that fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct to verify whether the test application is operating properly" (see Couch et al., [0057] and [0004] for displaying message string which allows viewing and verifying as disclosed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Couch et al. into Hamilton et al.'s system. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective and flexible way to manage and control messages in the queue since the function of reading and displaying messages on a queue provides the administrator with reading access to the electronic message itself not just its properties and header information. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and an interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

14. Claims 15-18 and 22 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al. (US Publication No 2003/0182464, effective filing date 02/15/2002) in view of Couch et al. (US Publication No 2003/0126109, effective filing date 01/02/2002), and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366, effective filing date 12/18/2001).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al. and Couch et al. do not teach "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server".

Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server" (see Robinson, [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Hamilton et al. (as modified by Couch et al.)'s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to implementing a queue on a java messaging service message server to provide an effective way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service message server is an asynchronous messaging server.

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al. and Couch et al. do not teach:

"selecting a profile identifying the host computer and having information to connect to the host computer, the profile further identifying the queue";

"logging on the host computer using the profile"; and

"connecting to the queue using the profile".

Robinson teaches:

"selecting a profile of the host computer having the host computer identification to connect to the host computer, the profile further having the queue identification" (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] and [0029] wherein connection factory encapsulating connection configuration information is equivalent to Applicant's "profile");

"logging to the host computer using the profile" (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] wherein open communication channel between an application and the messaging system is equivalent to logging as illustrated in Applicant's claim language); and

"connecting to the queue using the profile" (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] wherein connection factory is equivalent to Applicant's "profile" and the disclosure of using the connection factory to create a connection to a queue is equivalent to Applicant's claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Hamilton et al. (as modified by Couch et al.)'s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so since using profile to connect and log in the computer system and its resources (such as queues) provides effective and efficient way to access to the systems and resource as well as allows better control over resource accesses.

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson teach:

"selecting a consume control determining whether to consume the messages after the message is read" (see Couch et al., [0048] wherein READ or RECEIVE are example of consume control); and

"consuming the message when the consume control has been selected to consume the message" (see Couch et al., [0033] and [0048]).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson teach:

"displaying attribute headings including indicia identifying attributes of the message" (see Couch et al., [0070] and [0004]);

"displaying each of the attributes of the message adjacent one of the associated attribute headings" (see Couch et al., [0070]).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Hamilton et al. and Couch et al. teach "wherein one of the fields of the message structure is an attribute field, and wherein displaying the read message includes displaying attributes of the attribute field" (see Couch et al., [0004] and [0070]).

However, Hamilton et al. and Couch et al. do not teach "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service".

On the other hand, Robinson teaches "wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service" (see Robinson, [0003], [0014] and [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Hamilton et al. (as modified by Couch et al.)'s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide a convenient and flexible way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service is an asynchronous messaging system.

15. Claims 19 and 20 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al. (US Publication No 2003/0182464, effective filing date 02/15/2002) in view of Couch et al. (US Publication No 2003/0126109, effective filing date 01/02/2002), and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366, effective filing date 12/18/2001), and further in view of Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333, Patent date 07/27/1999).

As to claim 19, Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson teach all the limitations as recited in claim 18. However, Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson do not teach:

"displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message";

"selecting the properties attribute"; and

"displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message".

On the other hand, Landfield et al. teaches:

"displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message" (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A wherein displayed information related to each message represents a portion of header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute";

"selecting the properties attribute" (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] for selecting headers button); and

"displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message" (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein header information represents an entire text of the header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Landfield et al. into Hamilton et al.'s system (as modified by Couch et al. and Robinson). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to display messages on a queue. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is

managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

As to claim 20, Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson teach all the limitations as recited in claim 18. However, Hamilton et al., Couch et al. and Robinson do not teach:

"searching the message read from the queue for a string of text";

"identifying the message having text matching the string text".

On the other hand, Landfield et al. teaches:

"searching the message read from the queue for a string of text" (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 34-45]); and

"identifying the message having text matching the string text" (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 40-45]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Landfield et al. into Hamilton et al.'s system (as modified by Couch et al. and Robinson). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to manage and search messages on a queue. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 1-12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and claim objections, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571)272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner
Art Unit 2164
July 10, 2008